

7

## REMARKS

Rejection of claim 30 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as not complying with the written description requirement. To expedite prosecution, the Applicant has amended claim 30. Applicant reserves the option to pursue the unamended version of claim 30 in a continuation application. The amendments to claim 30 are clearly supported in the written description as filed originally, please see for example the text from page 11, line 31 through page 12, line 10. Applicant respectfully contends that the amendments to claim 30 overcome the Examiner's rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Rejection of Claim 30 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. patent number 6,650,431 issued to Roberts et al, hereinafter referred to as Roberts. The Applicant does not admit that Roberts is indeed prior art and preserves the option to antedate this reference asserted by the Examiner to be prior art. The Applicant respectfully requests careful consideration of the arguments provided below that support traversal of the rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e).

Claim 30 includes limitations of "selecting a first imaging related option to form images on the media ***using N of the plurality of pages of data on individual of the media***". (emphasis added) The Applicant respectfully contends that Roberts does not teach or suggest this limitation. In page 3, item 6 of the office action response, the Examiner states that "Roberts discloses a method for forming images on media using a plurality of pages of data (column 6, lines 40-48), ***comprising selecting a first imaging related option (black and white or monochromatic) (column 9, lines 16-33)*** to form images on the media using pages of the document". (emphasis added) The Applicant can not locate teaching in this section of Roberts upon the limitations from claim 30 recited above read. There is no teaching or suggestion in this section regarding an "option to form images on the media using N of the plurality of pages of data on individual of the media". If the Examiner believes there is disclosure in this cited section of Roberts

S/N: 09/430,675  
Case: 10991673-1  
Amendment D

(column 9, lines 16-33) or elsewhere within Roberts upon which the limitations of claim 30 recited above read, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's assistance in specifically identifying this disclosure.

According to MPEP section 2131, "A claim is anticipated only if **each and every element** as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (emphasis added) Because claim 30 includes limitations not taught or suggested in Roberts, the Applicant respectfully contends that a valid anticipation rejection of claim 30 is not present for at least this reason. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Roberts.

#### Rejections of Claims 33-35 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected claims 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by United States patent number 5,978,557 issued to Kato, hereinafter referred to as Kato. The Applicant does not admit that Kato is indeed prior art and preserves the option to antedate this reference asserted by the Examiner to be prior art. The Applicant respectfully requests careful consideration of the arguments provided below that support traversal of the rejection of claims 33-35 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e).

Claim 33 includes the limitations of "including **blank units of the media**, corresponding to the ones of the plurality of pages of data having the second characteristic, among units of the media having the images corresponding to the first characteristic according to the order" (emphasis added) The Applicant respectfully contends that Kato does not teach or suggest this limitation recited in claim 33.

On page 5 of the Examiner's office action it is stated that "including blank pages (replacement pages) corresponding to the ones of the plural pages (column 5, line 4 to column 6, line 59)". As recited in column 5, lines 27-30 and column 5, lines 39-42 Kato teaches that "Therefore, dummy pages (**replacement pages**) with a **predetermined message** indicating the insertion positions **are printed** on the monochromatic or color printing side" (emphasis added) and "In this embodiment, the LPB 21 **prints** dummy pages (**replacement pages**) 43 each with a **predetermined message** indicating that a color page is originally present at the page position 42." (emphasis added). Clearly, the limitation from claim 33 recited above of "**blank** units of the media" (emphasis added)

S/N: 09/430,675  
Case: 10991673-1  
Amendment D

9

cannot read upon these cited sections of Kato. Therefore, for at least the reason that the cited section of Kato does not teach all the limitations of claim 33, claim 33 is not anticipated by Kato. Additionally, because claims 34 and 35 incorporate by reference the limitations of claim 33, claims 34 and 35 are not anticipated by Kato. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully contends that the subject application is in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, allowance is respectfully request.

Respectfully submitted,

Kris R. Livingston

By Gregg W. Wisdom  
Gregg W. Wisdom  
Reg. No. 40,231

November 2, 2004  
(360) 212-8052

S/N: 09/430,675  
Case: 10991673-1  
Amendment D